

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed April 7, 2006. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

Claims 1-5, 11, 12, 16-18, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Muller, et al. Independent Claims 1, 11, 16, and 21 recite in general the ability to process packets in a gateway having a multi-processor environment, receive a set-up request packet for a communication session, initially processing the set-up request packet to determine which of a selected one of a plurality of processors in the gateway is to handle the set-up request packet, generate a set-up reply packet that includes a virtual identifier assigned to the selected one of the plurality of processors, and directly route in the gateway subsequent packets associated with the communication session to the selected one of the plurality of processors in response to the virtual identifier without performing the initial processing. By contrast, the portions of the Muller, et al. cited by the Examiner specifically state that every packet received is processed by its header parser and flow database manager, even when the received packet is part of an established flow. See col. 13, lines 15-28, of the Muller, et al. patent. Thus, the Muller, et al. patent is not able to satisfy the claim requirement of routing subsequent packets associated with a communication session directly to the selected one of the plurality of processors without performing initial processing by its switch processor equivalent structure. In addition, the Examiner readily admits that the Muller, et al. patent fails to disclose generation of a set-up reply packet by the selected one of the plurality of processors let alone

including the virtual identifier associated with the selected one of the plurality of packets in the set-up reply packet as provided by the claimed invention. As a result, the Muller, et al. patent fails to teach or even suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-5, 11, 12, 16-18, 21, and 22 are not anticipated by the Muller, et al. patent.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller, et al. in view of Ayanoglu. Independent Claim 1, from which Claim 6 depends, has been shown above to be patentably distinct from the Muller, et. al. patent. Moreover, the Ayanoglu patent does not include any additional disclosure combinable with the Muller, et al. patent that would be material to patentability of these claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 6 is are patentably distinct from the proposed Muller, et al. - Ayanoglu combination.

Claims 7-9, 13, 14, 19, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller, et al. in view of Kap. Independent Claim 1, from which Claims 7-9 depend; Independent Claim 11, from which Claims 13 and 14 depend; Independent Claim 16, from which Claim 19 depends; and Independent Claim 21, from which Claims 23 and 24 depend, have been shown above to be patentably distinct from the Muller, et. al. patent. Moreover, the Kap patent does not include any additional disclosure combinable with the Muller, et al. patent that would be material to patentability of these claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 7-9, 13, 14, 19, 23, and 24 are patentably distinct from the proposed Muller, et al. - Kap combination.

Claims 10, 15, 20, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller, et al. in view of

Isfeld, et al. Independent Claim 1, from which Claim 10 depends; Independent Claim 11, from which Claim 15 depends; Independent Claim 16, from which Claim 20 depends; and Independent Claim 21, from which Claim 25 depends, have been shown above to be patentably distinct from the Muller, et. al. patent. Moreover, the Isfeld, et al. patent does not include any additional disclosure combinable with the Muller, et al. patent that would be material to patentability of these claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 10, 15, 20, and 25 are patentably distinct from the proposed Muller, et al. - Isfeld, et al. combination.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments associated with this Application to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicant



Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

July 7, 2006

Correspondence Address:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, Texas 75201-2980

(214) 953-6507

Customer Number: 05073